

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8 and 9-11 are pending in this application. The Office Action rejects claims 2-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and rejects claims 1 and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicants amend claims 1, 7 and 10, and cancel claims 2, 3 and 9. No new matter is added.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 2-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of Applicant's invention. Applicant hereby amends claim 1, 7 and 10 and cancels claims 2, 3 and 9.

Claim 1, as amended, now properly incorporates the resin and condensation product recited in canceled claims 2 and 3. Dependent claims 4-11 now distinctly claim the subject matter which is regarded as the invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 4-11 are not indefinite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are earnestly solicited.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,468,718; hereafter "Kang") in view of Mizutani et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0198894; hereafter "Mizutani") or either of Bonk et al. (U.S. Patent No.s 4,731,273 and 4,751,269; hereafter "Bonk '273" and "Bonk '269," respectively). The Office Action asserts that Kang discloses each feature of claims 1 and 4-11 except for the claimed compound. However, Mizutani discloses "a resist composition comprising a crosslinking compound," and Bonk teaches adhesive resins having known crosslinker compounds such as tetrabutoxymethyl urea, which is described on page 8 of the instant specification as the preferred compound for formula 1. It would thus allegedly

have been obvious to an ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of the invention to prepare the material of Kang and to choose the known melamine crosslinker taught by Mizutani or the crosslinker recited in either Bonk reference. Applicant hereby amends claim 1, 7 and 10, cancels claims 2-3 and 9, and traverses the rejection.

Kang is directed toward a radiation absorbing polymer that absorbs a predetermined wavelength of radiation. In Kang, the nitrogen containing compound is described as an additive, and not the main component in the composition. Mizutani is directed toward a resist composition for use in an ultra-micro lithographic process. Mizutani, like Kang, teaches a nitrogen containing compound as an additive and not the main component in the composition.

Both Bonk references are directed toward a pressure sensitive adhesive composition. Bonk '273 discloses a heat-recoverable closure with a crosslinked pressure-sensitive adhesive, and Bonk '269 discloses an acrylate-type pressure sensitive adhesive. Neither Bonk reference teaches a relevant composition having a nitrogen-containing main constituent.

In contrast, instant claim 1 recites a compound of formula (1), the condensation product thereof or the resin produced from the compound, wherein the condensation product or the resin produced is contained in an amount of 50 mass% or more in a solid content of the composition for forming anti-reflective coating. The reference to "solid content" means components other than solvent components in the composition. See paragraph [0021] of the specification. Thus, the compound of formula (1) is clearly a main component of the claimed invention, and not an additive. This configuration leads to a high dry etching rate and a high anti-reflective effect even when it is used in a thin film.

None of Kang, Mizutani, or the Bonk references teach or suggest this feature, nor would it have been obvious to combine them because: 1) doing so would not have obtained the claimed feature or advantages thereof; and 2) the Bonk references are directed to an entirely separate field of endeavor. As discussed above, both Bonk references are directed

toward sensitive adhesive compositions, whereas amended claim 1 is directed toward a composition used in a lithography process related to manufacturing a semiconductor device. Furthermore, none of the references teach or suggest that these respective disclosed compounds could or should be used in amounts of 50 mass% or more, rather than as the mere additives as taught by the references.

For at least the forgoing reasons, Kang in view of Mizutani or either Bonk reference would not have rendered obvious instant amended claim 1 or claims 4-11 at the time of the invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Ryan C. Cady
Registration No. 56,762

JAO:RCC/axl

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: January 8, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--